

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION

LESLIE V. SULDON,

Plaintiff

VS.

BRUCE CHATMAN, *et al.*,

Defendants

NO. 5:06-CV-271 (DF)

PROCEEDINGS UNDER 42 U.S.C. §1983
BEFORE THE U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ORDER

Plaintiff LESLIE V. SULDON has filed a MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT in the above-styled case. Tab #26. However, his motion is not properly before the court, as the clerk has not made an *entry of default* which is a prerequisite to the granting of a judgment by default. Moreover, defendants BRUCE CHATMAN and VINOD SACHDEVA – the only defendants who have been served in the case – filed a timely Answer on November 27, 2006, thereby making an entry of default inappropriate. Tab #23. Accordingly, plaintiff's MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT (Tab #26) is **DENIED**.

The plaintiff has also submitted a "MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL CHARGES" (Tab #21), which – although it could be viewed as an amended complaint – does not set out any specific allegations against any individual defendant. Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion for additional charges is **DENIED**, but he is free to file a motion to amend his complaint with *specific* allegations against *specific* defendants which this court will review pursuant to Rule 15(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Finally before the court is the plaintiff's "MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF ASSETS BY DEFENDANTS" (Tab #22), which attempts to procure discovery through the court without a showing of a good faith effort to obtain the discovery without court assistance as required by Local Rule 37. Accordingly, the plaintiff's MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF ASSETS is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 5th day of DECEMBER, 2006.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Claude W. Hicks, Jr.".

CLAUDE W. HICKS, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE